DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 061 EA 014 335

AUTHOR Sistrunk, Walter E.
TITLE The Development of the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire, Forms 1, and 2.
PUB DATE Nov 81
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Lexington, KY, November, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Authoritarianism; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Field Tests; *Measurement Techniques; *Multiple Regression Analysis; Predictor Variables; *Research Design; School Supervision; Semantic Differential; *Supervisory Methods; Tables (Data); Teacher Motivation; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS *Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire

ABSTRACT

The development of two instruments useful in evaluating supervisory behavior is described in this paper. Form 1 of the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire (SBDQ) is an ordinal-type scale originally composed of eight sub-scales and 132 triads of items. Each item is composed of a very directive statement, a collaborative statement, and a very non-directive statement. Form 1 of the instrument was field tested on 107 graduate students who also completed the California F scale measuring authoritarianism. The results were correlated with their SBDQ responses. A step-wise multiple regression formula was used to analyze the data. The results indicated that most respondents preferred the directive mode of supervision. However, a significant majority preferred the non-directive mode of supervision of some behaviors. Few respondents indicated a preference for the collaborative mode of supervisory behavior. Form 2 of the SBDQ is a modified semantic differential instrument originally consisting of the statements contained in Form 1. Form 2 was administered to 60 graduate students along with the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Some of the findings are summarized in the text. (Author/MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED212061

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Walter E. Sistrunk

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE, FORMS 1, and 2

Walter E. Sistrunk
Professor of Educational Leadership
Mississippi State University

Presented at:
Mid-South Educational Research Association

Lexington, Kentucky
November, 1981

EA 014 335

Introduction

The purposes of the study were to determine: (1) the behavior of supervisors which teachers perceive as satisfying or dissatisfying, i.e., motivating or hygienic; (2) the type of supervisory behavior (directive, collaborative, or non-directive) which is most often motivational in the view of teachers; and, (3) to determine if Maslow's concept of a continuous hierarchy of needs is more or less accurate than Herzberg's Dual Factor Theory (i.e., Sergiovanni's Two Factor Theory of Supervision). The study has resulted in the development of instruments useful in evaluating supervisory behavior.

The literature pertaining to supervision of instruction is contradictory, non-theoretical, and based on inadequate research data. Much of it consists of little more than advocacy of certain supervisory practices and opposition to others. The paucity of hard data in the general field of supervision is exceeded only by the lack of it in the areas of teacher reaction to supervisory behaviors, evaluation of supervisory behavior, and teacher motivation to keep current, improve, and grow. However, there has been a growing interest on the part of theoreticians and researchers in supervisory behavior for several years. This interest has been shared by the writer and his associates. Our interests have led to the development of an interaction analysis system and an accompanying instrument. They have also led to the development of a theory of instruction and a rudimentary theory of leadership.

Long term interest in supervisory behavior and teacher reactions to it led to a search of the literature for more viable theories of supervision and more hard data drawn from research. This search of the literature went in many

directions. One of these directions was the general area of teacher job satisfaction/dissatisfaction and motivation to be productive teachers. It seemed axiomatic that much of a supervisor's efforts and time is spent working with those teachers deemed dissatisfied and unmotivated; yet, it also seemed that most of the faculty development activities organized and administered by supervisors were thought non-motivating by many teachers. The search for better theories and research led to the work of Frederick Herzberg, et al, and the application of it to supervision of instruction by Sergiovanni.

Considerable reflection on Herzberg's dual-factor theory and Sergiovanni's two-factor theory led to the conclusion that if either or both were substantially correct that Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory was questionable. Reviews of the literature revealed much criticism of Herzberg's theory and the methods which produced it. Yet, some of the literature seemed to strongly support Herzberg's position. The Herzberg/Sergiovanni position seemed worthy of further investigation. Thus the development of the SBDQ was begun. Work on it is not nearly complete; nowever, it has produced some predictable and some surprising results.

Development of The Instruments

It was decided that two instruments would be developed. Form 1 of the SBDQ is an ordinal type scale originally composed of eight sub-scales and 132 triads of items. Each item is composed of a very directive statement, a collaborative statement, and a very non-directive statement. Respondents were asked to choose the supervisory behavior they found most acceptable from each triad. Form 2 of the SBDQ is a modified semantic differential instrument originally consisting

of the 396 statements contained in Form 1. Respondents were asked to choose one from each of five pairs of bi-polar adjective descriptors of each statement.

The literature was examined by 25 graduate students and the senior researcher to determine the task areas of typical supervisors. Ben Harris' ten task areas were a useful beginning. Two other task areas were originally included. These 12 task areas have been combined into eight task areas which comprise the sub-scales of each instrument in the present forms. These eight sub-scales are: (1) curriculum development; (2) organizing for instruction; (3) staffing; (4) providing materials and facilities; (5) staff development; (6) special services; (7) community relations; (8) evaluating instruction.

The second step was to develop a list of the supervisory behaviors found in the literature and assign each to a task area. Over 300 behaviors were identified. These were reduced to 132 through use of a modified Delphi technique and some editorial license. The number of items have been further reduced to only 53. Each behavior was stated in a directive, collaborative, and a non-directive mode.

Form 1 of the SBDQ was field tested on 107 graduate students at Mississippi State University. These students also completed the California F scale (authoritarianism) which was correlated with their responses.

Form 2 of the SBDQ, sub-scales 2, 5, and 8 was field tested on 60 graduate students at Mississippi State University. These respondents also completed the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Research Form.

Both forms have been administered to additional respondents and these respondents have taken both the F scale and the TSCS but the data have not been run yet. Form 1 and Form 2 will be completed when the present data are run.

Findings

Form 1 of the SBDQ yielded an alpha co-efficient of .94 for the total instrument and alphas for the sub-scales ranging from .62 to .86. Approximately 35 percent of the items (those not accounting for 25 percent of the difference were deleted and the data were rerun). The alphas were slightly lower. This seemed surprising and we haven't really determined the cause yet.

A step-wise multiple regression formula was used to analyze the data. The results indicated that most respondents preferred the directive mode of supervision. However, a significant majority preferred the non-directive mode of supervision on some behaviors. Few respondents indicated a preferrence for the collaborative mode of supervisory behavior.

Black respondents and female respondents scored significantly higher on authoritarianism. Furthermore, they scored significantly higher in their choice of directive supervision. There were no significant differences in choice of mode of supervisory behavior attributable to level of education, administrative experience, or level of teaching assignment. Only authoritarianism served as a predictor of respondent preference to sub-scale 8, evaluation. Only race was a predictor of preferences of sub-scale 3, staffing. Only administrative experience served as a predictor for sub-scale 2, organizing for instruction. None of the demographic variables, when considered separately, served as a significant predictor for sub-scale 4, providing materials and facilities, and sub-scale 5, staff development. There were approximately equal numbers of males/females, Caucasians/non-Caucasians, and elementary/secondary persons in the sample.

Form 2 of the SBDQ is a modified semantic differential scale based on Osgood's model. It consists of eight sub-scales composed of the same items used on Form 1. However, each item is stated discretely and the items are

scrambled. Three of the sub-scales have been field tested thus far. These sub-scales are: 2) Organizing for Instruction, 5) Staff Development, and 8) Evaluating Instruction (instructors).

Five pairs of bi-polar adjectives were used as adjective descriptors of each item. These pairs of adjectives were:

satisfying	sweet	motivating	fair	pleasant
dissatisfying	bitter	non-motivating	unfair	unpleasant

Only the first and the last of adjectives listed above discriminated on the three sub-scales. The alpha co-efficients ranged from .74 to .94 and when all 183 items were considered collectively the alpha was .95. The adjective pairs have now been reduced by deletion of sweet/bitter and fair/unfair. All eight sub-scales have now been normed.

Form 2 was administered to 60 Mississippi State University graduate students along with the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS). A step-wise multiple regression formula was used to analyze the data. Behavior, one of the TSCS sub-scales, was a significant predictor of choice of adjective descriptors on all sub-scales of the SBDQ. Self-satisfaction and total self-concept, race, and level of education were significant predictors of sub-scale 5 responses regarding satisfaction/dissatisfaction; level of education, level of teaching assignment, race, and self-satisfaction were significant predictors of pleasant/unpleasant. Total self-concept, race, degree level, and self-satisfaction were significant predictors of satisfaction/dissatisfaction; whereas, self-satisfaction and level of teaching assignment were significant predictors of pleasant/unpleasant.

Summary

Data are still being collected in the field testing of these instruments.

It seems likely that each will yield a split-half type instrument even after substantial reduction of the number of items. Each form of the test will be correlated with the other, soon. Respondent's scores on the TSCS and the California F scale are now available on the entire population and will be used as predictor variables. The instruments will be further field tested, hopefully on populations in other states, in the near future.

Present evidence is disappointing regarding the adjective descriptors of motivating/non-motivating. Reasons for the responses have not yet been assessed.

It seems as though neither Maslow nor Herzberg is entirely correct regarding the satisfaction/motivation of teachers, if these data are believable. Both instruments will be further field tested, results will be disseminated, tests will be copyrighted and will be available to the education community.

These instruments will be useful in determining discrepancies between supervisor's self-perceived behaviors and behaviors their teachers perceive them as performing. They will also enable researchers to determine which behaviors are hygienic and which are motivating for a particular group of respondents.

It is possible that the researchers will be able to identify dimensions of supervisory behavior such as: thrust, production emphasis, apathy, trust, etc. A number of additional studies are already in progress and inquiries about use of either instrument are welcomed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Behling, Orlando; Labowitz, George; and Kosmo, Richard. "The Herzberg Controversy: A Critical Reappraisal." Academy of Management Journal, March 1968, pp. 99-108.

Friendlander, Frank. "Job Characteristics as Satisfiers and Dissatisfiers." Journal of Applied Psychology 48 (1964): 388-392.

Griffith, Francis. Administrative Theory in Education: Text and Readings. Midland, Mich.: Pendell, 1979.

Herzberg, Frederick. The Managerial Choice: To Be Efficient and To Be Human. Illinois: Dow Jones-Irwin, 1976.

Herzberg, Frederick; Mausner, Bernard; and Snyderman, Barbara G. The Motivation to Work. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959.

House, Robert J. and Wigdor, Lawrence A. "Herzberg's Dual-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction and Motivation: A Review of the Evidence and a Criticism." Personnel Psychology 20 (1967): 370.

Hoy, Wayne K. and Miskel, Cecil G. Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice. New York: Random House, 1978.

Sergiovanni, Thomas. "Factors Which Affect Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Teachers." Journal of Educational Administration 5 (May, 1967) 66-82.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Elliott, David L. Educational and Organizational Leadership in Elementary Schools. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1975.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Carver, Fred D. The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, Inc., 1973.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Starratt, Robert J. Supervision. Human Perspectives, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw Hill, 1979.

Terpstra, David E. "Theories of Motivation: Borrowing the Best." Personnel Journal 58 (July 1979): 377.

APPENDIX

Table 1

COMPARISON OF MALE AND FEMALE TEACHER'S RESPONSES TO TASK AREA 1

N=107

CRITERIA	Male Mean	S.D.	Female Mean	S.D.	F
Curriculum	15.3	1.88	16.8	2.17	13.06*
Level of Instr.	16.6	2.17	15.7	2.09	3.92*
Race	16.4	2.08	15.3	2.19	6.66*
Experience	16.0	2.20	16.2	2.15	.37

$F \geq 3.86$* sig. at .05 level

Table 2

COMPARISON OF MALE AND FEMALE TEACHER'S RESPONSES TO TASK AREA 2

N=107

CRITERIA	Male Mean	S.D.	Female Mean	S.D.	F
Experience	9.4	1.95	10.4	1.98	6.18*

Table 3

COMPARISON OF MALE AND FEMALE TEACHER'S RESPONSES TO TASK AREA 3

N=107

CRITERIA	Male Mean	S.D.	Female Mean	S.D.	F
Race	15.3	2.45	14.0	2.38	4.80*

Table 4

COMPARISON OF MALE AND FEMALE TEACHER'S RESPONSES TO TASK AREA 6

N=107

CRITERIA	Male Mean	S.D.	Female Mean	S.D.	F
Race	22.4	2.92	20.1	2.88	14.1*

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF MALE AND FEMALE TEACHER'S RESPONSES TO TASK AREA 7

N=107

CRITERIA	Male Mean	Male S.D.	Female Mean	Female S.D.	F
Race	17.9	2.80	16.4	2.70	6.38

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF MALE AND FEMALE TEACHER'S RESPONSES TO ALL TASK AREAS

N=107

CRITERIA	Male Mean	Male S.D.	Female Mean	Female S.D.	F
Sex	156.1	17.1	165.1	19.2	6.38*
Race	163.8	19.0	152.7	15.6	7.45*

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF RESPONSES WHEN AUTHORITARIANISM AND SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES WERE CONSIDERED FOR ALL TASK AREAS

N=107

PREDICTORS	R	R^2	R^2 Add.	Simple R	F
F Scale (Authoritarinism)	.267	.071	.071	-.27	8.06*
Sex	.321	.103	.032	.24	3.70*
Race	.366	.134	.031	-.26	3.74*
Experience	.370	.137	.002	.118	.27
Degree	.371	.138	.001	.019	.15
Level of Instruction	.373	.139	.000	-.144	.09

* Sig. F=> 3.86

TABLE 8

COMPARISON OF RESPONSES WHEN AUTHORITARIANISM AND SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES WERE CONSIDERED FOR TASK 1

N=107

PREDICTORS	R	R^2	R^2 Add.	Simple R	F
Sex	.332	.110	.110	.332	13.06*
Race	.392	.154	.044	-.235	9.49*
Degree	.397	.158	.003	.096	6.45*
Level of Instruction	.401	.160	.002	-.189	4.88*
Experience	.402	.161	.001	.059	3.90*

* Sig. F=> 3.86

TABLE 9

COMPARISON OF RESPONSES WHEN AUTHORITARIANISM AND SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES WERE CONSIDERED FOR TASK 2

N=107

PREDICTORS	R	R^2	R^2 Add.	Simple R	F
Sex	.237	.056	.056	.237	6.27*
Race	.265	.070	.000	-.040	1.53
Level	.254	.064	.008	-.175	3.61*
Experience	.262	.068	.003	.117	2.53

* Sig. F=> 3.86

TABLE 10

COMPARISON OF RESPONSES WHEN AUTHORITARIANISM AND SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES WERE CONSIDERED FOR TASK 3

N=107

PREDICTORS	R	R^2	R^2 Add.	Simple R	F
Sex	.315	.099	.099	.315	11.59*
Experience	.354	.125	.026	.235	7.45*
Race	.370	.137	.012	-.139	5.46*
Level	.373	.139	.002	-.169	4.14*
Degree	.376	.142	.002	-.072	3.33*

* Sig. F=>3.86

TABLE 11

COMPARISON OF RESPONSES WHEN AUTHORITARIANISM AND SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES WERE CONSIDERED FOR TASK 4

N=107

PREDICTORS	R	R^2	R^2 Add.	Simple R	F
F Scale	.213	.046	.046	-.214	5.03*
Level of Instruction	.289	.084	.038	.146	4.76*
Race	.326	.107	.023	-.209	4.10*
Sex	.347	.120	.014	.083	3.40*

* Sig. F=> 3.86

TABLE 12

COMPARISON OF RESPONSES WHEN AUTHORITARIANISM AND SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES WERE CONSIDERED FOR TASK 5

N=107

PREDICTORS	R	R^2	R^2 Add.	Simple R	F
F Scale	.252	.063	.064	-.252	7.16*
Race	.265	.070	.006	-.163	3.95*

* Sig. F=> 3.86

TABLE 13

COMPARISON OF RESPONSES WHEN AUTHORITARIANISM AND SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES WERE CONSIDERED FOR TASK 6

N=107

PREDICTORS	R	R^2	R^2 Add.	Simple R	F
Race	.343	.118	.118	.343	14.01*
Sex	.367	.135	.017	.159	8.11*
Degree	.376	.141	.006	.045	5.65*
Level of Instruction	.385	.148	.007	.156	4.44*

* Sig. F=> 3.86

TABLE 14

COMPARISON OF RESPONSES WHEN AUTHORITARIANISM AND SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES WERE CONSIDERED FOR TASK 7

N=107

PREDICTORS	R	R^2	R^2 Add.	Simple R	F
F Scale	.244	.059	.059	-.244	6.65*
Race	.295	.087	.027	-.239	4.96*

* Sig. F= 3.86

TABLE 15

COMPARISON OF RESPONSES WHEN AUTHORITARIANISM AND SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES WERE CONSIDERED FOR TASK 8

N=107

PREDICTORS	R	R^2	R^2 Add.	Simple R	F
F Scale	.228	.052	.052	.228	5.78*

* Sig. F= 3.86

TABLE 16

CORRELATION OF LEVEL OF AUTHORITARIANISM (CALIFORNIA F SCALE) WITH RESPONDENT'S CHOICE OF SUPERVISORY BEHAVIORS

N=107

CRITERIA		R
Task	1	-.16*
	2	-.04
	3	-.10
	4	-.21*
	5	-.25*
	6	-.18*
	7	-.24*
	8	-.22*
	Total	-.26*
	Sex	.24*
	Level	.21*
	Race	-.34*
	Experience	-.09
	Degree	-.06

R ≧ .16 Sig. at .05 level